DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 632 CS 012 732

AUTHOR Stallworth-Clark, Rosemarie; Scott, Janice S.
TITLE Identification and Contribution of Instructional Method to At-Risk College Students' Academic Performance in Social Science Courses.
PUB DATE [97]
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *College Students; Higher Education; *High Risk Students; *Instructional Effectiveness; Reading Programs; Reading Skills; *Social Sciences; Student Surveys; Teacher Behavior; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

A study identified the various teaching methods being used in a large university reading program and investigated the effect of the teaching methods on students' subsequent academic performance in social science courses at the university. Instructional methods were identified primarily through content analysis of instructor questionnaires and quantitative analysis of students' confirmation surveys. Students' social science course grades were obtained after they had exited the reading program and completed a self-selected social science course. Results indicated that 4 differing teaching methods were used in the reading program and were identified as methods framed in epistemologies which are supportive of basic skills, strategy training, and whole language instruction. Students' grades in the social science courses did not differ significantly by teaching method employed in the reading program. Findings suggest that factors other than the teaching methods employed in the reading-preparatory course are likely to have affected students' subsequent academic performance in the social sciences. Findings also suggest that for large academic programs, teaching methods can be identified through teacher self-report data that is corroborated with student-confirmation surveys. (Contains 19 references and 5 tables of data. Appendixes present the teacher and student survey instruments.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CS

ED 404 632

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stallworth-Clark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Identification and Contribution of Instructional Method to At-Risk College Students' Academic Performance in Social Science Courses

Rosemarie Stallworth-Clark
Georgia Southern University
Janice S. Scott
Clayton College and State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Rosemarie Stallworth-Clark, Department of Learning Support, Georgia Southern University, and Janice S. Scott, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Clayton College and State University.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Rosemarie Stallworth-Clark, Department of Learning Support, Georgia Southern University, POB 8132, Statesboro, Georgia, U.S.A., 30460 (Telephone: 912/871-1377; E-mail: rosemari@gasou.edu).

The purpose of this research was to identify the various teaching methods being used in a large university reading program and to investigate the effect of the teaching methods on students' subsequent academic performance in social science courses at the university. Instructional methods were identified primarily through content analysis of instructor questionnaires and quantitative analysis of students' confirmation surveys. Students' social science course grades were obtained after they had exited the reading program and completed a self-selected social science course. Data obtained indicated that four differing teaching methods were used in the reading program. They were identified as methods framed in epistemologies which are supportive of a) basic skills, b) strategy training, and c) whole language instruction. Students' grades in the social science courses did not differ significantly by teaching method in the reading program. These results suggest that factors other than the teaching methods employed in the reading-preparatory course are likely to have affected students' subsequent academic performance in the social sciences. The methodology employed in the study suggests that for large academic programs (when participant observation is not feasible) teaching methods can be identified through teacher-self-report data that is corroborated with student- confirmation surveys.

Identification and Contribution of Instructional Method to At-Risk College Students' Academic Performance in Social Science Courses

CS012732

The complexities involved in examining the teaching-learning process in post secondary settings are substantial. Obviously, numerous variables interplay as students learn from instruction and experience. Furthermore, learning and instructional theories, as well as teaching philosophies, are diverse. Contributing to the complexities are interdisciplinary perspectives which are formulated at differing levels of abstraction. Recently, utilizing a categorization system of Straw (1989), a group of investigators for IEA (U.S. Department of Education, 1995) identified 4 dominant reading epistemology systems they considered to hold currently important positions in world-wide reading theory and practice. The systems were a) transmission, b) interaction, c) transaction, and d) social construction.

Transmission adherents hold to view of a bottom-up process of reading contending that the meaning of text rests outside of the reader and that translation of the author's intention is the purpose for reading (Chall, 1983; LaBerge-Samuels, 1974). Interaction adherents hold to an interactive model for reading that describes reading as

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

an interaction between the text and the reader. That is, meaning is considered to reside not only in the text but also within the reader (Rumelhart, 1994; Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Perfetti, 1992; Sinatra & Royer, 1993). Transactional adherents hold to the view that meaning is indeterminate. That is, meaning does not reside in the text or in the reader but comes into being during a transaction between reader and text (Rosenblatt, 1994). The predominance of work associated with transaction has been concerned with the social-construction of knowledge, that is, how it is that multiple transactions may result from the same text (Fish, 1980; Roseenblatt, 1978; Straw, 1990). Social constructivists contend that meaning mediated through the reading transaction is dependent upon the social experiences of the reader and that reading and writing are essentially a single act of literacy (Fish, 1980; Goodman, 1985).

Teaching methods employed in the present study appeared to be theoretically framed by the four systems identified in the U. S. Department of Education investigation. That is, a) a transmission frame is presumed to have supported the teaching of reading sub-skills; b) an interaction frame is presumed to have supported the teaching of metacognitive strategies for learning from college texts; and c) a transactional/social construction frame is presumed to have supported the combining of reading and writing instruction in a student-centered approach to literary criticism and self-development. Furthermore, it was the premise of this principal researcher that the use of a combination of activities reflected the teachers' implicit theories of learning (Binkley, et.al, 1995; Cunningham & Fitzgerald, 1996; Shand, 1994) and that teaching methods were adopted by the instructors in order to provide conditions for the attainment of intentional learning goals. In sum, what the teachers believed about the nature of learning influenced the way they taught the reading classes.

The purpose of this study was to identify the various methods being used to teach reading in a large developmental studies reading department at a regional university in the southeastern United States and to investigate the effect of the instructional methods on students' subsequent academic performance in university social science courses.

Methods

Participants

The sample for this study consisted of 18 teachers and 523 students (recruited by their teachers) in a regional university reading program. Demographics for the 402 students who successfully exited the reading program are shown in Table 1. Two hundred twenty-five of the exited students enrolled in social science courses the following quarter.

Table 1 about here

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in this study. An open-ended survey, "Instructor Questionnaire" was developed to collect self-report teacher input on a description of the teaching method used in the college reading course. The questionnaire posed four open-ended questions to elicit teachers' narrative descriptions of their teaching role, strategies, and instructional materials. Teachers were also asked to elaborate on their teaching approaches. Provided on the questionnaire were descriptions of reading teaching methods. Descriptions were constructed from a review and synthesis of college reading instruction literature. The instructor questionnaire is presented in Appendix A.

The second instrument employed in the study was a simple-to-answer survey, the "Student Questionnaire" completed by the students at the end of the reading course. The instrument included four open-ended questions, each asking students to describe specific aspects of their instruction. Students described primary activities, instructional materials, a typical day in their reading class and what they perceived to be the major goal of the course. A checklist of learning activities was provided and students were asked to check activities which they consistently participated in during the reading course. The Student Questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

Design

Identification of the teaching methods was the initial task. Because the investigation was designed to examine the effects of all of the teaching methods being used in the post-secondary reading program, all instructors and students were recruited for the study. Instructors completed open-ended questionnaires describing their teaching methods and checked a description provided by the investigators as to the instructional method most descriptive of the teaching methods used in their classrooms. Teaching materials were examined, and selected instructors who appeared to arbitrarily define their methods were interviewed.

Instructional Method. Instructional methods used in the reading course were identified through the following data collection activities: (a) an instructor questionnaire; (b) examination of materials used in instructors' classes; (c) a student questionnaire administered by the RDG O99A instructors at the end of the course; and (d) follow-up interviews with selected instructors.

Student questionnaires were used as "confirmation surveys" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 121) to supplement the descriptive data of the instructors. Thus, the large number of students who could not be examined individually were allowed to provide valuable data. The student questions and checklist were designed to provide clearer descriptions of students' classroom experiences and to confirm the methods described by the teachers.

Procedures

Recruitment letters to all RDG O99A instructors informed them of the study--its purposes, procedures, expected benefits, and the need for student and faculty collaboration in the investigation. Instructors were assured that the study was not for purposes of recommending changes in their teaching methods but for purposes of investigating the role of teaching method as it affects students' academic achievement in a postsecondary setting. An Instructor Questionnaire and consent form were included with the recruitment letter.

Teachers' Perceptions of Teaching Method

Analysis of the instructors' questionnaires indicated that they had consistently classified their perceptions of the teaching role in the reading/study course with responses to the open-ended questions. Document analysis (identification of textbooks and materials used in the classes) supported the instructors' descriptions of their teaching methods. Descriptive phrases drawn from the instructors' questionnaires were assumed to reflect their perceived teaching roles and methods. Table 2 reports the instructors' classifications in terms of numbers of instructors using each method, number of class sections included in each method category, and number of participating students enrolled in the classes.

Table 2 about here

Basic Skills Teaching Role. Those who typed themselves as basic skills instructors described their role in the following examples as: "a guide to information;" "to teach many skills;" "to be a diagnostician to determine a student's weak skills;" "to give explanations, direct practice and give immediate feedback;" "to providing materials and learning situation/environment in which students can make individual progress."

Primary instructional materials listed by the basic skills instructors ranged from "required textbook with novel and skill practice sheets" to "my own materials." Although cooperative learning groups were listed, group activities were always listed last by these instructors. Direct instruction was the first teaching strategy listed by all (4) of the basic skills instructors.

Analysis of the questionnaires of those instructors who categorized themselves as basic skills instructors led the researcher to operationalize basic skills instruction as instruction that focused on the development of specific and discrete reading skills. Students' reading skills were developed primarily in isolation from whole-text,

and learning activities were typically sequentially ordered and practiced. Students practiced finding main ideas of paragraphs and short passages, identified major and supporting details, drew inferences, and practiced recognizing the relationships of ideas presented in short text selections.

Strategy Training Teaching Role. Those who typed themselves as strategy training instructors described their role in the following examples as: "an enabler to develop students who will be successful in reading in various disciplines through the development of reading/study strategies;" "a developer of positive attitude toward learning for transfer to other classes;" "as a guide to promote students' self-awareness of weak areas;" "to teach students how to manage their major reading classes in college;" "to guide and conduct;" "to help students to put knowledge to use for themselves."

Primary instructional materials listed by the strategy training instructors were reading texts with chapter length selections for various disciplines, namely, history, biology, and psychology. Direct instruction and lecture recitation were the first teaching strategies listed by four of the five instructors. One instructor listed "group problem-solving" as her primary teaching strategy. Cooperative groups were listed by all. Only one strategy training instructor listed student cooperative learning groups last.

Analysis of the questionnaires of those instructors who categorized themselves as strategy training instructors led the researcher to operationalize strategy training instruction as instruction that focused on the development of autonomous learning strategies. Students were taught to self-regulate their reading/learning tasks in college through the selection and application of appropriate strategies and to organize text content selectively so as to facilitate the rehearsal of information for maximum retention. Students received training in mapping, charting, organizing information on concept cards and time-lines, and marking and annotating text. Goal setting, time management, mnemonics, test preparation and test-taking strategies were also included. Students took objective and subjective tests on chapter readings.

Strategy Training with Analytical Reading Teaching Role. These instructors categorized themselves in a strategy training role with qualifying comments such as "I basically use a reading/study strategy approach, but also draw elements from both the basic skills and whole-language approaches;" "I present strategies that will help students become proficient in reading and studying at the college level;" "I do use some skill instruction for inference, figurative language, and tone and mood...I also use journals to reinforce what students are learning;" "I do use the skills approach to teach students to analyze shorter reading selections;" "I use some of the whole-language approach since students use journal writing as a way to evaluate comprehension;" "I vary my teaching strategies to meet specific objectives"; "My role is to assess the needs of my students."

Primary instructional materials used in strategy training with analytical reading classes included reading texts with selected college text chapters as well as shorter selections for students to analyze. The reading texts were the same in strategy-plus and strategy training instructors' classes. In addition, most of both groups of instructors also used a weekly news magazine for instruction. All (3) of the strategy training-plus instructors stated that they varied their teaching strategies among direct instruction, lecture-recitation, and cooperative learning groups. One of these instructors stated that she used lecture-recitation and direct instruction most often. Another added that some days she used more than one of the listed strategies.

Analysis of the questionnaires of these instructors and several follow-up informal interviews led the researcher to operationalize this method as "strategy training-plus" instruction. In addition to training students in the selection and use of learning strategies, these instructors required students to occasionally analyze short sections of text within larger portions of text. Students were required to draw relevant inferences and to analyze writers' patterns of organization in the short selections.

Whole-language Teaching Role. All (6) of the instructors who typed themselves as whole-language instructors described their teaching role to be that of a "facilitator of learning." In descriptions of the whole-language teaching role, instructors made comments such as: ..."to help students find whole worlds previously

unknown to them through their reading," "to provide students with numerous opportunities to transact with texts," "to help students to see the significance of reading," "to motivate student involvement," "to only present material in an interesting fashion."

Materials listed by the whole-language instructors were primarily novels, autobiographies, essays, and reader anthologies. One whole-language instructor reported the use of a textbook designed to improve reading proficiency. This same instructor stated that she used all of the teaching strategies listed on the instructors' questionnaire, but she identified her teaching method as "whole language." Five of the six whole-language instructors listed cooperative learning groups and group discussions as the predominant teaching strategy in their classrooms.

Analysis of the questionnaires of those instructors who categorized themselves as whole-language instructors led the researcher to operationalize whole-language instruction as instruction that focused primarily on the development of writing skills through literary responses to readings. The primary teaching strategy described by the whole language teachers was group discussion of readings. Most of the whole-language classes in this study were taught by two instructors who shared teaching responsibilities for both reading and writing learning activities.

Student Perceptions of Teaching Methods

Because it was important to know whether or not students perceived classroom experiences in ways similar to their teachers, each item on the student questionnaire checklist was totaled for the students within each instructor-identified method group. The following arbitrary cut-off criteria were used to establish categories for the students' summed responses: (a) 75% or more students in the group checked the item = (+)—students considered this activity to be a feature of their instruction in RDG O99A; (b) less than 50% of students in the group checked the item = (-)—students considered this activity to be a non-feature of their instruction in RDG O99A; (c) more than 50% but less than 75% of students in the group checked the item = (0)—an indeterminate activity. That is, data appeared unclear as to how students viewed the activity. Student questionnaires with every item checked were discarded from the analysis process. A majority of students (445) returned questionnaires to their instructors at the end of the quarter. Students' responses on the open-ended questions were not analyzed due to difficulty in reading students' handwriting and lack of clarity of student responses. Follow-up interviews with students were not feasible. Because instructors and students did not respond to identical questions on their questionnaires, teacher-student perceptions could not be compared correlationally. Table 3 reports the aggregated student responses to each of the 22 items on the checklist.

Table 3 about here

Results

Features Common to All Teaching Methods

Analysis of the Student Questionnaire data indicated that three items were checked by all participating students to be features of their RDG O99A instruction. The unanimously checked instructional features were: No. 6, marking important ideas in texts; No. 13, analyzing readings by identifying main ideas and organizational patterns; and No. 21, frequent interactions with classmates and teacher during class. Likewise, three items were considered by all participating students to be non-features of their instruction. Unanimously checked non-features were: No. 7, completion of a library research assignment that included a search for books and periodicals; No. 8, visiting the Learning Resources Center Tutoring Center for tutoring in reading/study strategies; and No. 12, reading more than one assigned novel.

Features that Discriminated Teaching Methods

Several student-response patterns appeared to discriminate between instructional methods. For example, only those students of whole-language instructors appeared to consider the following items to be features of their

instruction. No. 9 (+), using a word processor for completing writing assignments; No. 15 (+), writing evaluations of classmates' work; and No. 17 (+), keeping a portfolio of one's own work. In addition, No. 22, (-) taking lecture notes, was checked as a non-feature by whole-language students only.

Specific non- and indeterminate features identified the basic skills method. Basic skills instruction was the only method described by the students as not including self-evaluations of personal work, No. 14 (-) the annotation of text, No. 5 (-), and conferencing with the RDG 099A instructor, No. 18 (0). Further, students who received basic skills instruction differed from all students receiving other methods concerning oral presentations. Basic skills students described the activity as neither a feature nor a non-feature (0), while other methods described oral presentations (No. 16) as a non-feature (-).

Negations of Teaching Method

There were a limited number of negations of instructors' comments, particularly with regard to student reports of activities in the strategy training classes. For example, strategy training instructors listed group discussions as a primary teaching strategy, however, less than 75% of their students agreed; strategy training instructors did not report the use of vocabulary lists, but over 75% of their students reported the use of vocabulary lists; and strategy training instructors did not report the use of exercises and drills, but over 50% of their students reported use of exercises and drills.

In order to determine if significant pre-reading course differences existed among students in the method groups, analyses of variance were performed on pre-course student variables (students entering Scholastic Aptitude Test Verbal scores, College Placement Examination in Reading scores, and high school grade point averages. Results indicated that students were not statistically significantly different on these pre-course variables. An analysis of variance summary table of the pre-course student variables by method is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 about here

Since the purpose of the research was to determine the effect of teaching methods used in the university reading course on students' grades in subsequent social science courses, univariate tests of statistical significance were run to determine whether social science grade differences existed between the four groups of students. Social science grades for students receiving the four reading teaching methods were not significantly different. $F_{3,3022} = .63$.

Although the strategy training-plus group showed a higher grade point mean, grade differences in the social science courses did not show statistically significant differences between the students in the four method groups. This suggests that teaching method in the university reading course did not have a strong effect on the students' social science course grades. See Table5.

Table 5 about here

Discussion and Conclusion

The identification of teaching methods in a large academic program is an arduous task. This study showed that obstacles can be surmounted and that researchers can analyze processes within and products of a complex program. Qualitative and quantitative data was usefully employed to gain insights heretofore considered too obtuse to investigate. Students and teachers in the present study provided valuable data for the purpose of identifying and assessing program efforts.

Post secondary reading instruction is often offered without knowledge of instructional effectiveness. This study was an effort to contribute to our knowledge base concerning the effectiveness of instructional methods currently being used throughout the United States in the field of developmental education. The present study is the first of its kind in the field of post secondary reading to examine differences in subsequent grades for students

taught with a variety of teaching methods in a university reading program. The lack of statistically significant differences between students who were taught with various teaching strategies, materials, and activities, provides a productive area of research.

Little is known about the experiences of the students in the social science courses. A scant number of investigations have examined the post secondary teaching-learning context. Transfer research has indicated, however, that learning must be situated in authentic tasks for knowledge to be useful and therefore used in similar situations (Driscoll, 1994; Singley & Anderson, 1989). Students in college reading programs must apply acquired knowledge in a broad range of academic contexts. Situating pre-college reading activities in authentic tasks is difficult for researcher and practitioner.

Social science professors were not involved in the study in any way. Multiple tasks and contexts are likely to have presented innumerable teaching-learning combinations. Follow-up interviews with participating students may have been beneficial. Social science professors and students could most likely enlighten researchers as to the nature of learning tasks and the transfer of knowledge from prerequisite reading/study courses to regular courses.

It is important that additional research be conducted to determine the generalizability of these findings. The researchers recommend the use of identical questions on the "Instructor and Student Questionnaires" as well as random participant observations in the reading course classes and in students' subsequent social science classes. Linking reading and social science courses for students may be a means to a clearer understanding of postsecondary reading and learning tasks. Teaching strategies, reading tasks, and materials involved may be examined closer and college preparatory reading classes can be improved to effect transfer to reading-intensive social science courses.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE
Name _____
(Please use extra sheets of paper if needed.)

1. In a short paragraph, please describe yourself as a post-secondary reading teacher. Please include the role of the teacher and the role of the learner as you view them.)

2. What primary instructional materials do you use in your reading classes? Please list required and supplementary texts.

3. What teaching strategies do you most often use in your RDG 099A classes? (Examples might be, but are not limited to: direct instruction (you introduce topic followed with a presentation, implement guided practice with feedback, and allow for independent practice); lecture-recitation (you present information and then encourage processing through active questioning); cooperative learning groups (you facilitate group work so that students engage in collaborative learning efforts and have a stake in one another's success); group discussions (you facilitate group discussions with questions and comments aimed at helping students explore connections between ideas).

4. As precedent has been set in the past--for exiting qualification and for counseling students--all Reading 099A students will be required to take the exit College Placement Examination in Reading (CPE). How much emphasis will you place on students' practicing for the CPE exit exam? (That is, how many practice tests, how much tutoring center assistance will you recommend, how much classroom drills, etc.?)

5 Which of these listed teaching methods would most nearly describe your teaching method? (Check one.) In the space provided (or on extra sheets), elaborate on the method you checked--if you like. If the printed description is a clear description, no elaboration is necessary. If none of the methods, or all of the methods apply, please explain. Remember, this is not an evaluation of your teaching method, merely a description of it.

___ BASIC READING SKILLS APPROACH

I primarily teach students how to improve discrete reading skills with emphasis upon the incremental development of reading skills that foster analytic reading. Instruction is structured so as to promote students' successful accumulation of increasingly more complex skills. Materials consist primarily of reading selections followed with carefully constructed sequences of exercises. There is an instructive balance between reading selection sources, e.g., selections are drawn from literature, magazines, newspapers, and textbooks.

___ READING/STUDY STRATEGY TRAINING

I primarily train students to read to learn from college texts through the use of reading/study strategies. Rather than an isolated skills approach to reading, this instruction views the reading process as a whole, and may be described as a strategic approach to reading, with content guiding the selection of strategies. Students are taught to select and to apply appropriate reading/study strategies through instructor-modeling, practice, and feedback. Students read and are tested over content drawn primarily from college texts from a variety of disciplines.

___ WHOLE LANGUAGE APPROACH

I de-emphasize the teaching of discrete reading skills, study strategies, and test-taking, and emphasize reading and writing as part of the social process of learning. I encourage original thinking and the ability to compose and write coherently about the meaning of a reading. Reading and writing are viewed as a natural part of the process of learning and are not taught separately but viewed as interrelated instruments of language for interpreting and organizing experience. Student s work most with book-length literature.

APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Student's name_____ Student's Social Security No. _____

Student's RDG 099A Instructor's Name _____

Directions. In the spaces provided, please answer the following questions about your RDG 099A class experiences.

1. What have been your primary activities in the class?

2. List the primary instructional materials used in the class (names of textbooks, novels, magazines, newspapers, or if applicable, "teacher-made" materials).

   1. _____

   2. _____

   3. _____

3. Describe a typical day in your RDG 099A class. (If you are in a joint reading/writing class, describe a typical reading/writing class.)

4. What do you feel has been the major goal of the RDG 099A class?

Place check marks beside the following activities that you consistently participated in during the class. I...

___discussed reading assignments with small groups of classmates
___wrote summaries of assigned readings
___learned instructor-provided vocabulary lists
___wrote a series of journals about reading assignments
___annotated text to indicate important ideas
___marked important ideas in texts
___was required to complete a library research assignment that included a search for books and periodicals
___visited the Learning Resources Tutoring Center for tutoring in reading/study strategies
___used a word processor for completing writing assignments
___was required to read, discuss, and write about current events in the news
___was required to read a novel
___was required to read more than one assigned novel (write number read on blank)
___analyzed readings by identifying main ideas and organizational patterns
___was required to write self-evaluations of my work
___was required to make an oral presentation(s) to the class
___kept a portfolio of my work
___conferenced with my teacher about my work
___completed reading/writing exercises and drills in my reading textbook
___completed photocopied reading/writing exercise sheets
___often interacted with classmates and teacher during class
___took lecture notes

TABLES

Table 1

Demographics of Exiting Students

	Percent	n
Gender		
Female	61.7	248
Male	38.3	154
Ethnicity		
African-American	48.3	194
American Indian	0.2	1
Asian-Pacific Islands	0.5	2
Hispanic	1.0	4
Caucasian	50.0	201

Table 2

Number of Participating Instructors and Students by Method

Method	Instructors	Class Sections	Participating Students
BS	4	6	81
ST	5	10	167
ST+	3	6	80
WL	6	9	195
Total	18	31	523

Note: BS = basic skills instruction; ST = strategy training instruction; ST+ = strategy training plus analytical reading instruction; WL = whole-language instruction.

Table 3

Student Questionnaire Responses by Method

Item Number					
		BS	ST	ST+	WL
N = 445	n =	76	145	72	152
1. discussed reading assignments with small groups of classmates		(+)a	(0)b	(+)a	(+)a
2. wrote summaries of assigned readings		(-)a	(0)a	(+)b	(+)a
3. learned instructor-provided vocabulary lists		(-)a	(+)b	(+)b	(-)a
4. wrote a series of journals about reading assignments[a]		(0)a	(0)a	(+)a	(+)a
5. annotated text to indicate important ideas[a]		(0)a	(+)a	(+)a	(+)a
6. marked important ideas in texts		(+)b	(+)a	(+)a	(+)a
7. was required to complete a library research assignment that included a search for books and periodicals		(-)a	(-)a	(-)a	(-)a
8. visited the LRC Tutoring Center for tutoring in reading/study strategies		(-)a	(-)a	(-)a	(-)a
9. used a word processor for completing writing assignments		(-)a	(-)a	(-)a	(+)a
10. was required to read, discuss, and write about current events in the news		(-)a	(-)a	(0)a	(-)a
11. was required to read a novel[a]		(0)a	(-)a	(-)a	(+)a
12. was required to read more than one assigned novel		(-)a	(-)a	(-)a	(-)a

Table 3, continued

13. analyzed readings by identifying main ideas and organizational patterns	(+)a	(+)a	(+)a	(+)b
14. was required to write self-evaluations of my work	(-)a	(0)a	(0)a	(0)b
15. was required to write evaluations of my classmates' work[a]	(-)a	(-)a	(-)a	(+)a
16. was required to make an oral presentation to the class	(0)a	(-)a	(-)a	(-)a
17. kept a portfolio of my work[a]	(0)a	(-)a	(-)a	(+)a
18. conferenced with my teacher about my work	(0)a	(+)a	(+)a	(+)a
19. completed reading/writing exercises and drills in my reading textbook[b]	(+)a	(0)a	(+)a	(0)a
20. completed photocopied reading/ writing exercise sheets	(0)a	(0)a	(0)a	(0)a
21. often interacted with classmates and teacher during class[a]	(+)a	(+)a	(+)a	(+)a
22. took lecture notes[a]	(+)b	(+)b	(+)b	(-)a

Note. (+) = 75% or more of the students receiving the method selected the item as a feature of their reading instruction; (-) = less than 50% of the students receiving the method selected the item, thus item was considered to be a nonfeature of their instruction; (0) = more than 50%, but less than 75% of the students selected the item as a feature of their reading instruction, thus the item was considered to be an indeterminate feature. (a) = students' responses confirmed instructors' description; (b) = students' responses negated instructors' description. Students confirmed teachers' descriptions of their methods—BS = 91%, ST = 86%, ST+ = 86%, WL = 91%.

Table 4

Summary Table for Analysis of Variance of Pre-Course Group Means by Method

Variable	Ms_{method}	Ms_{error}	df_{error}	F
	Between Methods			
SATVERBAL	313	1829	511	0.17
HSGPA	0.01	0.21	517	0.05
CPE IN READING	39.19	13.90	507	2.82*

*p < .05

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Social Science Grade Point Averages by Reading Course Teaching Method

Method	N	Mean	SD
Basic Skills	37	1.46	1.05
Strategy Training	64	1.51	1.07
Strategy Training-Plus	38	1.75	1.03
Whole Language	86	1.59	0.95
All Methods	225	1.57	1.02

REFERENCES

Anderson, R.C., & Pearson, P.D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research, (pp. 255-292). New York: Longman.

Binkley, M.R., Phillips, L.M., & Norris, S.P. (1995). Creating a measure of reading instruction. In B. Brickman and C. Litman, Methodological issues in comparative educational studies: The case of the IEA reading literacy study (NCES Publication No. 94-469, pp. 193-229). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Chall, J.S. (1983). Stages of reading development, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cunningham, J.W., & Fitzgerald, J. (1996). Epistemology and reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 31(1), 36-60.

Driscoll, M.P. (1994). Psychology of learning for instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Fish, S. (1980). Is there a text in this class? Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goetz, J.P. & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.

Goodman, K.S. (1985). Unity in reading. In H. Singer & R.B. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (3rd ed., 813-840).

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S.J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 6, 293-323.

Perfetti, C.A. (1992). The representation problem in reading acquisition. In P.B. Gough, L.C. Ehri, & R. Treiman (Eds.), Reading acquisition (pp. 145-174). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1978). The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1994). The transactional theory of reading and writing. In R. B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (pp. 1057-1092). Newark: International Reading Association.

Rumelhart, D.E. (1994). Toward an interactive model of reading. In R. B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, and H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (pp. 864-894). Newark: International Reading Association.

Shand,J. (1994). Philosophy and philosophers: An introduction to western philosophy. New York: Penguin Books.

Sinatra, G.M., & Royer, J.M. (1993). Development of cognitive component processing skills that support skilled reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85(3), 509-519.

Singley, M.K., & Anderson, J.R. (1989). The transfer of cognitive skill. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Straw, S.B. (1989). The actualization of reading and writing: Public policy and conceptualizations of literacy. In S.P. Norris and L.M. Phillips (Eds.), Foundations of literacy policy in Canada, (pp. 165-181). Calgary, Alberta: Detselig.

Straw, S.B. (1990). Challenging communication: Readers reading for actualization. In D. Bogdan and S.B. Straw (Eds.), Beyond communication (pp. 67-89). Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (1995). Methodological issues in comparative educational studies: The case of the international evaluation of educational achievement (IEA) reading literacy study, 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE